

REMARKS

1. Claim 1 objection:

3 Claim 1 was objected because ‘extension pole’ lacked an antecedent basis. In
4 response the term ‘extension pole’ has been amended to ‘extension arm.

2. Rejection of Claims 8, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

6 Claims 8, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by
7 Emoto (U.S. Patent No, 4,922,694). Clams 9-11 were considered allowable if rewritten in
8 independent form.

9 In response, Claim 9 has been cancelled and the limitations recited therein has been
10 added to Claim 8. The dependency of Claim 11 has been amended from Claim 9 to Claim 8

11 Claims 10 has been cancelled and rewritten as new Claim 14. New Claim 14 now
12 includes all of the limitations originally recited in Claim 8 and the limitations recited in
13 Claim 10.

14 Claims 12 and 13 have been rewritten in independent form and include all of the
15 limitations originally recited in the base claim (Claim 8).

16 No new matter is being introduced by these changes.

17 For all of the above reasons, all of the pending claims should now be considered
18 allowable.

19 | Respectfully submitted,

21 DEANA CRAINE

22 | Reg. No. 33,591

23 || Attorney for Applicant